

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
December 13, 2017
Lake County Courthouse, Large Conference Room (Rm 316)
Meeting Minutes

MEMBERS PRESENT: Steve Rosso, John Fleming, Sigurd Jensen, Rick Cothorn, Frank Mutch, Lee Perrin, Janet Camel, Dave Goss

STAFF PRESENT: Jacob Feistner, Clint Evenson, Lita Fonda; Wally Congdon; Consultant Joel Nelson

Also: Rob Edington, Tiffani Murphy; Gale Decker; Consultant Dave DeGrandpre

Steve Rosso called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

MC KENDRY & KAMMERZELL LAKESHORE (BUOY) (7:02 pm)

Clint Evenson presented the staff report. (See attachments to minutes in the December 2017 meeting file for staff report.) The buoy was proposed to be an orange, teardrop-shaped buoy. On pg. 3, he directed to strike the first bulleted item in #5.

Steve asked if the County had jurisdiction over allowing buoys that weren't mooring buoys. Jacob pointed out the title of the section in the regulations was 'Buoys' rather than mooring buoys. H.2.b did say buoys shall be mooring buoys as defined under the marking system, which wasn't talking definitively about purpose but rather the type of buoy that should be used. He wasn't convinced they couldn't permit other types of buoys.

Steve confirmed with Clint that the applicant wasn't present. He thought the purpose of the buoy was safety, not mooring. What was the hazard or safety situation? Clint described that the park was located to the north. The applicant wanted to place the buoy right off that northern boundary. It was somewhat of a blind corner, with boats potentially coming around it. The buoy would give a little bit of a buffer from where kids were potentially playing or swimming off their dock. Steve guessed because they were on a point, a lot of boats rounded the point much closer to their dock and shoreline than the applicants would like, and they hoped if they stuck something in the water, people would be forced to go around it.

Lee asked if it would be a function for the parks to place buoys to make sure boats entering into that area would stay clear of the parks and children playing in the water. Steve didn't know. He thought that was an issue here. As the lake got busier, a lot of land owners were concerned about boats not observing the state regulations that required people to stay 200 feet offshore in their motor boats except where they had to go at a speed such as to make no wake when they were within that 200-foot distance. If the County got involved in this type of buoy permitting, they would have lots of applications from landowners who wanted to stick things out in the water to keep people farther offshore. If the County wanted to do that, they should think about specifics of how that should be done. Perhaps the buoys should be marked 'no wake zone' or 'swimming area' or something like that, and communicate some real purpose to the motor boaters.

Lee agreed with Steve. He was an avid boater on the lake, and hadn't seen an orange buoy anywhere on the lake. He thought an orange buoy might represent danger but he wasn't sure what it would really mean. Steve recalled a recent situation in an area between Cromwell Island and the lakeshore where a couple of buoys were put up to let people know it was a no-wake zone. These were white and orange buoys that were marked 'no wake zone'. He thought those were approved and permitted through the Fish & Wildlife Commission. Did the County review those? Jacob replied no. They would be out beyond the low-water mark. That would be in the public's area so the County wouldn't review that. Steve said this was located beyond the low water mark, at 75 feet out but he thought Jacob was right. These buoys [by Cromwell Island] were 200 feet out but they had a similar purpose. He wondered if [tonight's buoy] was in the jurisdiction of the Fish & Game Commission.

Steve's other question involved the location of the buoy. The rules talked about the setbacks from riparian boundaries, which were different than property boundaries. In the description, it said 'an extension of the property boundary', which might or might not be close to the real riparian boundary. The location of this buoy, if permitted, seemed like it should be within the riparian boundaries of the property rather than the property boundaries. In the section on buoys for the lakeshore protection zone, it didn't say anything about setbacks from boundaries. It only talked about 75 feet out from the shoreline. Riparian boundaries were described in the definition section of the lakeshore regulations as a line that extends from the point where the property line hit the high water mark, but it extends out perpendicular to the shoreline. He drew an example on the chalkboard and described it. It was important to evaluate the potential location so it was within the riparian property lines of this piece of property if the Board approved this.

Janet asked if documented accidents occurred in this area. Clint wasn't aware of any. Lee asked if there was a statement from the owner stating an actual purpose other than a safety and navigator buoy. Clint thought it was an all-encompassing safety for the lakeshore there, for boating and swimming. Lee asked if an orange buoy was defined as a hazard, to stay away. Clint said they looked into the Coast Guard definitions of what a buoy was. Jacob clarified that staff weren't requiring an orange buoy. It was what had been purchased and proposed. It could be denied. They could pick another color. Lee said red seemed like a standard danger color to him. Jacob referred to the earlier comments on the regulations. The Uniform State Waterway Marking System required white with blue stripe for a mooring buoy. Because this was not a mooring buoy, they didn't want boaters to approach it as a mooring buoy so they didn't think it needed to be white with a blue strip.

Frank recommended going with Coast Guard standards. Eventually people might learn the rules on the lake. It'd be nice to have the types of buoys and marking consistent.

Wally said the state had a set of rules for how buoys were marked. For the purpose of navigation, the only two things that could regulate it were the US Coast Guard and the MT Dept. of Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP). For purposes of a navigation buoy, the County couldn't give a permit. They didn't have the jurisdiction because it was a navigable waterway, which reserved it to the Coast Guard and FWP. If the buoy was red, he would put the buoy on his right and go to the left of the buoy. If he was coming from the south, he'd be going inside the 75 feet between the buoy and the pier. Red on the right was how you returned, the port color. At night,

orange would look red. This was what they didn't want people to do. He didn't think they had jurisdiction to do it for that purpose of navigation for number one. For number two, if somebody ran into it and the County had given it wrongly, they were staring at a problem. FWP or the Coast Guard had the regulatory authority over it.

Motion made by Steve Rosso to recommend denial at this time, and to recommend that the applicant contact the Fish & Game Commission/ Fish, Wildlife & Parks to look into some other way to get a buoy to provide them some safety. He noted there were specific buoys for specific kinds of safety things. When the applicant investigated this, they should know exactly what kind of safety thing they were trying to accomplish. Wally added that Fish & Game could write a ticket if someone broke the rules because [Fish & Game] put it in for a safety issue. This was on the edge of a private person regulating navigation, which had no teeth. If there really was a safety issue, Fish & Game [would be] more than happy to step up and do the right regulation with the right markers, plus if the State marked there, Fish & Game would probably patrol it. **Motion seconded by Rick Cothorn.** Frank suggested adding wording to the motion that the County lacked jurisdiction.

Public comment opened: None offered. *Public comment closed.*

Jacob checked if the applicants proposed to tie a boat to this buoy and it conformed in every way, if that would that be denied too. Steve said if they were interested in having a mooring buoy then the Board was within its jurisdiction to evaluate that. With the last couple of buoys the Board looked at, he thought they'd had a problem with people applying for buoy locations that didn't keep the boat within the riparian boundary as the wind blew it around the buoy and as the anchor line on the buoy moved with the currents. To him, the thing that was missing here for a mooring buoy was to make sure the boat stayed in front of the applicants' property rather than the neighbors'. Frank noted the mooring buoy would be a different color. Steve said one issue with a mooring buoy was it often had a big boat attached to it that people would see. A small buoy was a different kind of problem. With a mooring buoy, they were at less risk of someone hitting the buoy.

John said if this came back to the Board, knowing the intended purpose of the buoy and what the applicants were trying to accomplish would make things easier. The Board had a better chance of helping the applicant solve the problem if they knew what it was. Clint said the description was basically for safety, for people swimming and for those coming closer to their property. Would having the buoy on the property line be a problem if it was a different shape? Steve recapped what Wally had pointed out. If it wasn't a mooring buoy, they needed to go to some other agency to get a buoy permit rather than the County. Given direction from the County Commissioners, from Wally or from staff that said the County definitely had jurisdiction over placing buoys for other purposes than mooring, they'd consider it.

Rob E mentioned his original conversation with the applicant. They had children that would swim out from the dock and boats came around that corner. They were concerned about their kids being hit. Steve thought that was a legitimate concern. He thought they should talk to the state to see if it was okay to put in a buoy specific to that swimming issue. Rick said FWP were doing the 'no wake' enforcement by Cromwell this summer on jet skis.

Lita asked for the motion to be restated since an addition had been suggested.

Steve Rosso restated his motion to recommend denial at this time, and to recommend that the applicant contact the Fish & Game Commission/ Fish, Wildlife & Parks or other state agency to permit a safety buoy at this time, and that they should be specific about the purpose of the buoy. The County Planning Board felt that they lacked jurisdiction for a non-mooring buoy. Motion had been seconded by Rick Cothorn. Motion carried, all in favor.

GROWTH POLICY REWRITE (7:30 pm)

Steve explained the Board would hear from staff, then the public comment and then have Board discussion.

Joel Nelson, consultant with Land Solutions, described the process so far. The first draft was being submitted to the Board for preliminary comments. Draft 2 would then be created and submitted to the Dept. of Commerce for partial release of grant funds. They were not at the public review process yet although they were taking public comment as they went. He talked about two public comments that arrived after materials were sent to the Board. These were both handed out to the Board. (See attachments to minutes in the December 2017 meeting file for staff memo, draft, written public comment and handouts.) One letter focused on rehabilitation of existing housing stock and the other was comments from the Tribal Council. The Tribal Council requested more time to formulate additional comments that they could provide sometime in January. The consultants were trying to stick to the project schedule, which would include coming back to the Planning Board with the second draft in February, so they would be putting together the second draft immediately after the [January] Planning Board meetings. Joel talked about how the public could access the document and related information on the web at www.planlakecounty.com, including comments received during the summer. He talked about the level of input by the public. Around 90 people attended the meetings during the summer and they got a couple hundred responses to the survey. The public was engaged and aware. There were a couple articles in the local newspapers.

Public comment opened:

Robin Steinkraus, executive director of the Flathead Lakers, commented. It would have been good to have more time. The Flathead Lakers provided comments on the 2003 growth policy [inaudible] development as related to their mission as well as drafts of the [upcoming] growth policy. The November draft looked like a good start. They appreciated that the policy recognized the importance of water quality and the many benefits the County's water resources provided. She outlined a few observations and suggestions for consideration.

- Chapter 3 Growth Policy Framework, Updates/ Revision: one-year, five-year and citizen updates (pg. 22). These do not describe opportunities for public review and comment. These should be stated in the policy.
- Chapter 4 Key Issues (pg.24-25): Information sources for the issues should be cited. There was information there she wasn't aware of. The public would like to know where that information came from.

- Key Issue 1 Quality of Life vision statement: Add the importance of sustaining the natural and cultural amenities that contribute to the quality of life.
- Key Issue 3 Economic Development vision statement: Specify protecting important natural and agricultural resources and amenities along with maintaining the distinct character of the communities in rural areas.
- Chapter 6 Natural Resources,
 - Timber Resources (pg. 36): Change from ‘Timber Resources’ to ‘Forest Resources’. Forests provided many benefits in addition to timber, including fish and wildlife habitat, recreation opportunities and clean water. This section could be expanded to include the multiple benefits and uses that forest lands provide.
 - This section cited information from the Lake County Conservation District’s forest initiative website. Instead, cite information from the land managers themselves, including the Flathead National Forest and the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes (CS&KT).
 - Sand & Gravel Resources (pg. 37): She didn’t have time to do much research on this. They had commented on proposed sand & gravel operations in Flathead County so she knew those in riparian areas could lead to a lot of pollution. There might be value in looking into this issue more to see if an opportunity to develop some new regulations was warranted.
 - Fish (pg. 38): Fish were at the top of the aquatic food chain. This section should also recognize the importance of the native aquatic life, both plants and animals, that support the fish community.
- Chapter 8 Land Use, Development & Regulations (beginning pg. 58):
 - The Lakers had supported the Density Map & Regulations (DMR) since it was first proposed. She was pleased to see it would be retained through this revision of the Growth Policy (pg. 60-63).
 - Water quality protection was another benefit of the DMR, as they’d pointed out many times, and should be recognized in the revised policy.
 - The long discussion of possible flaws in the regulations and problems encountered, many of them should be condensed and the problems and flaws clarified.
 - A recommendation [to provide] greater flexibility in the mid-density regions should state some costs versus benefits of the recommendation if you were going to continue to have a long discussion in the next draft.
 - The process for updating the DMR should be briefly described.

Jim Baker represented Friends of Lake Mary Ronan, an organization of roughly 50 to 60 people that worked to protect the water quality of the Lake Mary Ronan area. He commented on the DMR.

- He was pleased also to see they wanted to retain the DMR plan. It said ‘selectively retain’. He was very interested to know how they would selectively keep the Density map and how the selection would be done.
- Try to keep the density policies the same up in the Lake Mary Ronan area because it had served them well. He commended them for their work so far. It looked very complete.
- Robin added some very good suggestions. He supported the things she said.

- He looked forward to the next plan and hoped they retained the DMR in the Lake Mary Ronan area

David Passieri was a realtor who represented mostly the Mission Valley area. He commented on the DMR.

- The crux of the DMR regulations from the perspective of property rights seemed to be hurting ultimately the long-term viability of the County. Economic trends changed. He thought that was a big reason why there was a revisionary process with the DMR or Growth Policy.
- They'd heard today that the Growth Policy, when complete, opened up the floodgates for some federal grants and maybe state grants.
- He appreciated Lake Mary Ronan and maintaining the DMR. That area had issues with nitrates and the lake and so on.
- County-wide they were wanting to recognize new trends such as housing trends, smaller homes, subdivisions that might come together and have a density of 1 acre, where a portion of land within that subdivision was set aside for community-wide for them to have their own organic-type growing area, somehow instituting a level of community-based ideas but higher density as well, maybe requiring more trees, etc., per acre so it still maintained a greenscape but also enhanced the tax base. He didn't see those types of creative ideas.
- In other areas, with regards to DMR, it wasn't regulatory in his mind and didn't have true jurisdiction legally. It had been used as a guide. If they had another entity, the CS&KT Corporation, not wholeheartedly adhering to the agreement at the same time, it didn't work. Even if they did, where was the jurisdiction to actually enforce that? He was happy to see it was selective and still a moving target.
- He'd like to see the county maintain green areas and a [inaudible] approach, maybe more higher density areas, neighborhood and subdivisions strategically located. People were coming through the area, liking the views but heading to the cities to the north. This valley being agriculturally based was not enough to support or to rely upon for the big industry growth.

Public comment closed.

Joel suggested that small things like typos or edits could be emailed to him. This would give more time to talk about substantial comments.

Steve commented on two points he identified as very important. One was balancing property rights and neighbor or community rights. The other was making sure the County provided appropriate opportunities or steps for higher density development.

- Chapter 9 Implementation, Key Issue 5 Land Use & Development, Goal 5.1 Respect private property rights of landowners & neighbors (pg. 90) had something missing [related to chapter 8].
- Chapter 8 Land Use, Development & Local Regulations (pg. 58): This chapter needed to have a discussion of property rights and neighbor/community rights, and discuss the idea that for the community to operate well, some kind of balance was needed between the two. He'd like to see some discussion at least about and an acknowledgement of the fact

that there were both property rights and neighbor/community rights. The neighbors had some expectation that as the neighborhood that they invested in developed, land use and such things didn't drastically change.

- The concern of the County attorney and many others in previous discussion of the DMR was about whether or not the County actually provided opportunities for higher density development close to urban areas and if they were supplying the infrastructure. It was very important that when they kept the DMR, they needed to make sure they had actions in the Growth Policy to make sure they didn't have that issue again. Efforts [needed to be] made to provide opportunities for high density development close to the existing urban areas like the DMR regulations recommended and that this was really achievable.

Janet Camel referred to the recommendation from Joel to focus on chapter 9 with tonight's comments when Planning Board packets on this item were distributed. The Tribal comments submitted were substantially on chapter 9 for this reason. The extension request for providing comments on chapters 1 through 8 was just for a few weeks. If this was going to be presented in February, she asked if getting comments to Joel by the middle of January would be enough time for him to incorporate them by the Feb. Planning Board meeting. Joel replied they needed to get the draft to the Board in advance of the meeting. They were trying to stay on track with the scope of work and project schedule. They requested an extension from the Dept. of Commerce, the grant provider. He hadn't seen the response. Janet said so much information was missing in chapters 1 through 8, to which the letter from the Tribes alluded on pg. 2. She thought it was necessary to paint a complete picture of the services and information that described Lake County. The Tribes would try to be very specific so it would be easy to add sentences if they were approved. She wanted to be sure they gave the whole picture, such as that Salish Kootenai Housing Authority managed 21 community sewer and water systems on the Lake County portion of the reservation. That was substantial and that information wasn't included. The Division of Fire, 18 Tribal police officers and numerous recreational facilities which were available to everyone were also not mentioned. Those services were important to include. This was why they were asking for the additional time.

Steve asked if there was a public comment deadline. Joel said to stick to the plan, they'd have another hearing on draft two. That would be essentially the public hearing of the Planning Board. It could be extended. If they started a meeting in February, the Board might want to continue the discussion in March. Steve said there would be an opportunity for edits to happen after that. Joel said it would be nice to get it through the majority of the big edits for the next draft. It wasn't his decision. Dave DeGrandpre, the principal planner for Land Solutions was here and might speak to it. Ultimately if there were some controversy, it would be a decision for the County Commissioners about changing the project schedule. Steve checked if [the consultants] could live with final comments coming in on Mon, Jan. 8. Joel said they were getting mixed up. They were trying to come back to the Planning Board in January, and over the next few weeks, wrap things up. The Commissioners would be in February.

Dave DeGrandpre of Land Solutions said there were a few pieces here. At this point the County was eligible to submit the draft Growth Policy as it was right now to the Dept. of Commerce to seek reimbursement. He didn't think that was a concern. He appreciated and thanked Joel for wanting to keep to the schedule. In terms of having an effective public process and making sure

that they were collecting information, he thought if Planning Board was to have a public hearing and make a recommendation to the Commissioners, which was part of the official adoption process required in Montana law, there wasn't a statutory timeline for that to happen. To shoot for the Feb. 14 meeting, if they had comments by Jan. 15, they could take 10 days to revise the draft at the consultant level and set it up for the Planning Board.

One reason they liked to have it roughly a month ahead of time was they had to run public notice in the newspaper, and it had to be out there for 15 days. When they advertised, they wanted to make sure a draft was available for the public to actually see. He thought Jan. 15 provided adequate time if they could get comments by then. They could turn around a draft within 10 days, advertise and have the draft available for public review so there would be ample time to comment. He put that out there for the consideration of the Planning Board and also the Planning Staff. Jacob said they had a scope of services and a timeline that was agreed upon between the Commissioners and Land Solutions. It had to be agreed upon by the Commissioners and Land Solutions if they wanted to extend further the scope of services and timeline. He didn't think they could answer tonight.

Steve said they needed to get back to those who wanted to prepare further public comment, such as Janet Camel and also Robin Steinkraus. Jacob thought that the more time was extended now, the less time they would have to comment later. Steve said the more thorough the review at this level, they would have less review with fewer changes on the next draft. Joel noted he'd put out emails and milestones through the project. After the deadline and when they would come back to the Planning Board for the public hearing were resolved, he would put out a notification. They would also be in contact with Janet and Robin. Joel affirmed for Jim Baker that this could be put on the website.

Steve returned to the Board members each having an opportunity to make some general comments about the Growth Policy. Then they would get into some specifics.

Frank thought it was a great effort and much more streamlined than the previous one. It was a good start.

Steve asked for general comments on chapter 1, if the Board thought something was definitely missing.

Chapter 1 (pg. 8-12) and general:

- Janet: Incorporate more information about the cultural background in the County. The Tribes had two chapters in the Comprehensive Resources plan that could be incorporated by reference, particularly the History and Culture chapter. This was available at cskt.org. Steve said he'd been able to google the Flathead Reservation Comprehensive Resource Plan.
- Frank: Pg. 10: Add the date of the Homestead Act. Janet supplied the date of 1910.
- Frank: For 'cultural', a number of European cultures loved and revered this land, coexisted, and were a part of this.
- Dave G: General comment: A unique thing about Lake County was the percentage of people that lived outside urban areas. He contrasted with Miles City with 9,000 people in

a county with 12,000 people overall. This created unique problems, situations and responsibilities for Lake County. For example, for law enforcement, if everybody was within a 5-mile radius versus spread evenly through the county, your expenses and ability to respond were different. This went back to Janet's comment on Tribal police. For instance, in the year that he's lived north of St. Ignatius, two accidents happened nearby, with Tribal police arriving first to both. The way the population was spread out created some unique characteristics to keep in mind.

- Janet: First paragraph, pg. 10: Regarding the Treaty of Hellgate in the 7th line, starting with 'with which', please reword to 'with which the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes reserved the reservation solely for their exclusive use and benefit' for accuracy.

Chapter 2 (pg. 14-15):

- Steve: Vision statement: The discussion was good but he didn't know if the vision statement reflected it all. Balance between property rights and the neighbors' rights were an important part of the vision the County should have. The vision statement could use words like independence, freedom, self-sufficiency, liberty, community, cooperation, sharing and interdependence. They could do more with the vision statement. He wrote 'achieving a balance between the independence, liberty and freedoms we all individually strive for and the cooperation with our neighbors that makes a community and allows us together to effectively share resources and services we all require.' Frank liked that and Dave G concurred that [the vision statement] needed more work.
- Dave G: A vision statement should indicate where they think they wanted to be in the future. What is our ultimate goal? This was a nice statement but didn't really say what they were achieving. You wanted to be definitive. If these [goals] were accomplished, what did we see as our community being in the future?

Chapter 3 (pg. 17-22)

- Steve: 5-year reviews (pg. 22): There had been issues with getting periodic reviews done. One problem was if they ended up on the same year. Some comments were needed about how to schedule and consider the staff workload and other regulations besides the growth policy. One problem had been they've looked at each set of regulations and policies separately without keeping in mind that they needed to work on all of them.

Citizen Updates (pg. 22):

- Steve: They could expand this section and specifically talk about the 1-year and 5-year review where they talked about citizen updates and opportunities for making some changes to keep this up-to-date.
- Frank:
 - The last part of that second sentence about growth policy by private citizens and so forth was an editorial comment. The sentence could be scratched.
 - He asked about the 'appropriate fee' referred to in the last sentence, which he thought meant if you wanted to comment, you had to submit a fee. Joel explained this was if a citizen wanted to pursue an amendment to the final adopted Growth Policy. Steve thought it could be clarified that this fee was for amending the Growth Policy, which was different from making a comment.
- Steve: [The information on the fee] wasn't spelled out and could be expanded.

- Janet: Chapter 9, 5.3.1, action 145 (pg. 92): Regarding the concern about the reviews, add a sentence saying you could amend those regulations that required frequent reviews to a more realistic schedule based on need and staff availability. Maybe they didn't need to review regulations in an area unless citizens requested it.
- Steve: A review didn't require changes. The ones that took a long time were those requiring changes. Janet asked why they had to have mandatory reviews unless it was by state statute. Steve thought they could look into that.

One-year, 5-year review and Citizen Updates (pg. 22):

- John: He had a concern on the 'appropriate fee'. Why was the fee necessary? It discouraged changes. Joel said it would cover the costs for writing staff reports, doing the public process, and meeting with the Planning Board. It took some County resources. Jacob confirmed for Frank that a fee would be required to change a zoning regulation.
- Frank: If there was a mandatory review every 5 years, the citizens could have input without paying a fee.
- Steve: There would be public input for the 1-year and 5-year review periods and no fee was required to make a public comment. If you wanted to make an amendment to the Growth Policy at some time other than those times, and initiate a process that wasn't budgeted, scheduled and planned, then some of the cost needed to be borne by the person who couldn't wait until the next regular review.
- Joel: There might not be a full amendment process that's gone through for the 1- and 5-year reviews. It could be the Planning Board just got together to review it.
- Steve:
 - It needed to be spelled out in the 5-year and 1-year sections that these were regular reviews involving public input.
 - Under 'Citizen Updates, be specific that those were updates other than the regular reviews.

Chapter 4 (pg. 24-25):

- Steve:
 - Key Issue 1: Quality of Life (pg. 24): Add 'by making only reasonable compromises in our enjoyment of our natural and cultural amenities' to the end of the Vision statement to better reflect the 'Issue statement, which had quite a bit of discussion of natural and cultural amenities.
 - Key Issue 3: Economic Development (pg. 24): Our healthy, natural environment was also one of our competitive advantages, along with such as Flathead Lake and the small town/rural character, and needed to be reflected in the 'Vision Statement'. It was important to maintain the distinct character of our communities and rural areas and make improvements, and improve the economic viability of local business and families. They didn't want to kill the goose that laid the golden egg by compromising the natural and cultural amenities.
- Dave: Economic Development (Key Issue 3) (pg. 24): Were they talking about development as attraction of new businesses or the existing businesses where 'support business retention and development' was mentioned? They were really looking at two different things. A lot of economic growth would occur from expansion of existing businesses. Often, those took one set of effort to support as opposed to going out and attracting a new business to move to the area. A lot of communities in American

economic development efforts had two distinct directions or plans. One was for the growth of the existing business and one was for the attraction of new business. They needed to clarify what was being pursued there.

- Frank: Key Issue 5, Land Use and Development (pg. 25): Property rights were important. He referred to Steve's description of individual and community property rights, and then mentioned the varying perceptions about land use and development. There were different views. Some felt they didn't want more development or improvement or more commerce. Others wanted more jobs.
- Janet: Key Issue 3: Economic Development (pg. 24):
 - Just before the vision statement, insert 'culturally appropriate' after 'support and provide'. For cultural and religious reasons, the Tribes did not allow public access to some lands.
 - At the end of the vision statement, change the end to say 'the long-term economic viability and cultural sustainability of the area.' It was for other cultures as well, not just Tribal. The Tribes worked hard for cultural sustainability and saw it as important. With 3 non-members for every Native American in the County, it was difficult for those cultures to thrive.

Chapter 5 (pg. 27-33):

- Steve:
 - Population (pg. 27-28): Add a discussion of summer versus winter. The population might change rather dramatically between summer and winter. It was a different kind of environment than some counties had.
 - Projections (pg. 27): Add some discussion of what the contributing factors might be for the projected population decline of 2%. As the years went by, specific discussion that's based on certain assumptions needed to be known in case the assumptions turn out to be invalid so adjustments could be made.

Additional Chapter 4:

- Janet: Key Issue 4: Local Governance & Leadership (pg. 25): In the second paragraph, add 'some' in front of 'public sentiment'. Frank thought there were more than some. Steve thought Janet's point was we didn't know if that was a majority or not. It was some but not all.

Chapter 5 continued (pg. 27-33)

- Steve: Economy section (pg. 31): Add discussion of tourism. He listed some categories from Figure 6: Forestry, Fishing & Ag Services; Arts, Entertainment & Recreation; Real Estate & Rental & Leasing; Accommodation & Food Services; and Retail Trade. Those added to 21 to 26% of the economy, depending what you included. Those were largely driven by the tourist economy. Some discussion of that needed to be included.
- Frank: Summary (pg. 28): Regarding the County detention center, add 'and the source of financing these facilities'. Part of the discussion was the source of funds.
- Janet: Economy Profile (pg. 31): The letter from the Tribes commented on the number of jobs that the Tribes provided for non-Native people, which were in the hundreds. Those jobs needed to be recognized. She talked about the reasons and history pertaining to Tribal preference. She hated to have language in the document that slanted things in a

negative way about the employment that the Tribes provided for people here. If they could have the opportunity to wordsmith the last sentence under Profile, she would appreciate that. Rick was unclear on how she perceived negativity there. She read the last sentence and suggested clarifying by saying ‘however, hundreds of jobs and contracts already exist for non-Indian people here in Lake County.’ She affirmed for Rick that the preference still remained. She was trying to explain why the preference was there. John confirmed with Janet that she was saying there was no need to bring this as an issue. She hoped they could somehow revise that. Steve said she recognized that there were hiring preferences. Even with the hiring preferences in place, there were a lot of non-Indians that were employed by the Tribes. He thought that was okay to point out. Frank thought the Job Corp program for heavy equipment was still going. He’d like to see consolidated road departments where the Tribes could work on County and City roads. The [building] trades were where the jobs were, and with computer experts. Janet described a grant just written. They would be developing curriculum with the college next year for the building trades. They were bringing that back.

Chapter 6 (pg. 35-40):

- Steve: Timber Resources (pg. 37): At the top of the page, he reiterated what Robin Steinkraus said about the forest issues. The information from the Conservation District was the only source of information. Find out what the Forest Service, CS&KT and maybe the U of M Forestry Dept. thought about the condition of the forests rather than using just one group’s opinion.
- Frank: Mention the devastating fires, which was part of management. He thought the Tribes did a better management job than the Forest Service. Multiple use needed to come back.
- Janet:
 - That was one of the sections that they’d like to provide additional comment on, too.
 - Sand & Gravel Resources (pg. 37): She agreed with Robin’s comment about ground water quality being affected by some sand & gravel pits. In areas where the aquifer and water table was very close to the surface, some of the pits were going pretty deep. She gave an example of a deep pit in the area where the aquifer provided the drinking water for the city of St. Ignatius and was only 40 feet deep. If asphalt was mixed in the pit and they had a spill, it could contaminate the drinking water for hundreds of people. They needed to be more careful on how they regulated gravel pits, although it was a state responsibility. We should look at some of these aquifers where there were shallow water tables.
- Frank: Timber Resources (pg. 36-37): The Forest Service paid in lieu of taxes on timber sales that went into the Counties. When they didn’t harvest timber, it hurt the local economy. This was a negative economic impact. Steve said there was a balance there. The recreational opportunities that might be lost with heavy timber harvesting also impact the economy. Frank said enlightened silvaculturalists dealt with that. The old Forest Service multiple use included recreation whereas now they simply let the forest burn. That was the current view, in his option.

- Rick: Fish & Wildlife (pg. 38): Maybe good news with reference to Lake Mary Ronan, in that the invasive northern pike were gone per the best information that he had. Some nasty birds (cormorants) remained.
- Steve: Fish (pg. 38-39): There was a section on aquatic invasive species (AIS) here, which certainly impacted fisheries. They had a lot of other impacts. Add a sentence at the end of that that said ‘Invasive mussels spread to the Flathead Basin impacts to the fisheries, real estate values, tourism and the quality of life will be significant.’ This comment on AIS in our County could be in the real estate and housing section, the fisheries section, the economics section or a lot of places. It didn’t need to be in all those places but it could be. It needed to be somewhere in here.
- Janet: Fish (pg. 38-39): Why did they only talk about Swan Lake and Lake Mary Ronan? What about Flathead Lake, the reservoirs and Lake McDonald? The Tribes could provide specific comments that talked about some of those other significant water bodies in Lake County. This was an example where they could give the County more information. Rick asked how many lakes were in the County. Janet said it was documented in their comprehensive plan, by reservation rather than by county. They could do it in GIS and figure that out. They typically looked at lakes larger than 5 acres in size. Lee said the concern was certain fish in certain areas. That was why they had these mentioned. Janet said not all of the fisheries had been stable since 2003 so she’d like to get more information in this section if they could. [The Tribes] would be happy to produce that. [The Board] could put in whatever amount they thought was good.
- Steve: Wildlife (pg. 39): The Bison Range wasn’t mentioned. It was an important enough attribute to the County that it could be included. Lee noted the draft talked about bighorn sheep and antelope. Especially with antelope, the only place in Lake County you had those was at the Bison Range.
- Rick: He mentioned the wolves. Janet said the Tribes were doing some wolf hunting regulations, which could be added to this. Rick thought that was good.
- Janet: Cultural Resources (pg. 40): At the bottom of the 1st column, add the Tribal Historic Preservation Office. This office also maintained a data base. They provided information for subdivision review and referred to that data base.
- The Tribes had a land-based cultural resources chapter in that comprehensive plan that would be good information to incorporate by reference. She checked with Jordan in the audience, who agreed.

Chapter 7 (pg. 42-56)

- Steve: Emphasize the idea that managing growth depends on cooperation between the different governmental entities here. It reflected the issue they had with the DMR. They needed to make sure that if the County recommended high density development somewhere that they’d done their best to work with those urban areas to make sure there was capacity with their infrastructure to handle that high-density development. He noticed several places [in this chapter] where they could emphasize that.
- Frank: Add cooperation in addition to coordination. Somewhere, put in a pitch for joint efforts, such as in road maintenance functions, where the municipalities and the Tribes could share in it. This would save a lot of money.
- Rick: It would benefit the cities and everybody if the sheriff sought out contracts with the small cities for service.

- Frank: He'd like to see one law enforcement agency.
- Steve: Water supply and wastewater treatment systems (pg. 49 on): The discussion mentioned whether or not there was additional capacity to accommodate growth in some of these communities, such as Charlo, Pablo and Arlee. It wasn't mentioned for the cities of Polson and Ronan and the town of St. Ignatius. It would be good to note whether they had capacity or capacity problems. If they had problems, that could be reflected in the goals and actions in chapter 9. Frank asked about Elmo. Janet explained the problem with Elmo was they did a master plan based on public comment before they developed/expanded the system. They had so many hookups set aside for Tribal homes that they had some capacity for non-Tribal homes and they did serve those but it wasn't unlimited capacity. Steve thought the document should note whether there was or wasn't capacity in Elmo. Janet said they could prioritize working with those districts that had capacity. Steve said they could help those that didn't have capacity to expand it.
- Janet:
 - Intergovernmental Coordination (pg. 42): Included in the letter, the Tribes managed 21 community sewer and/or water system. The Tribes spend millions of dollars on County roads and bridges, including rebuilding. She listed examples. They had a 5-year transportation improvement program that they asked people to comment on. Maybe they could do a better job of getting the road programs together to comment on each other's 5-year improvement plans.
 - Federal government (pg. 45): in the first sentence, add 'north of the reservation boundary' to the end of the 1st sentence. Joel and Janet clarified that she just wanted it to be more specific.
 - Education (pg. 47): For Two Eagle River School, correct 'elementary' to 'eighth grade' near the top of the second column.
 - Power (pg. 47): Change 'hydroelectric power sources' to 'multiple power sources'. The group discussed the various power sources. Frank suggested hydroelectric and multiple.
- Dave G: Medical Services (pg. 47): At the beginning, clarify that members of any Native American tribe could utilize Tribal Health services. Joel suggested that 'Enrolled members of any federally recognized Tribes' replace 'Tribal members' at the beginning of the sentence. Janet noted pregnant spouses could also be served by Tribal Health.
- Steve: Fire protection facilities (pg. 51): Property tax revenue went to most of these fire districts. They didn't want to leave the impression that the County didn't support these fire districts with tax revenue.
- Janet: Water supply and wastewater treatment systems (pg. 50): They missed Round Butte Water and Yellow Bay Water for community water systems, plus the 21 Tribally managed community sewer and/or water systems.
- Steve: State & federal highways (pg. 52): MT Highway 28 was left out.
- Janet: Strategy... (pg. 50):
 - Add 'fees for service' to the end of the first sentence end in column two. She thought rather than county taxes, each district charged a fee for service billed to the customers, which was the primary funding. She asked if that could be checked. Frank thought it was primarily funded through taxes. Janet said the sewer and water districts charged a maintenance fee to their customers for service. Lee said that was true in Jette Meadows. They had a separate water district and

were charged completely separate from the County. Frank thought they could add a sentence that there were fees charged for other services. Janet thought it was fees for services rather than taxes. Steve said maybe that needed more research.

- In the next sentence, costs for improvements could come from grants and loans at a cost to the users. She described what usually happened when a sewer district wanted to expand and couldn't get enough grant money. It was usually covered by a loan and an increase in the fee for service. Adding 'loans' was important; 'through public investment' could go or stay.
- #4 (pg. 50): Perhaps replace on 'an annual' basis with on 'a regular' basis. She asked if updating the CIP annually would add to the County burden. Steve thought that had been around for a long time and was already established. Joel clarified he took this from the CIP. He thought the Commissioners managed that document. Commissioner Gale Decker said they submitted a Capital Improvements Plan every 5 years, so it was updated every 5 years. Steve noted that needed to be researched. Frank asked where it was defined. Lee said chapter 7 talked about it. Joel said it was a Community Infrastructure Plan and it was also a Capital Improvements Plan. Gale said they went to the various agencies, like the Sheriffs' office, transfer station and Weed department, and asked what their plans were for the next 5 years, as far as capital improvements and expenditures. Then the County put out what they were looking at as far as significant outlays of money in the next 5 years. It was a guiding document. Joel said you could [say] the draft community infrastructure plan was the document that was adopted. Steve said it covered a 5-year period. Joel said then it talked about statutes for capital improvements and plans. It used both terminologies. Much of the section on pg. 50 was pulled from this document.
- Steve: #4 (pg. 50): They needed to make a distinction if one [CIP] was updated every year and one was updated every 5-years. Joel said he could double-check to make sure it was correct.
- Janet:
 - Fire Protection Facilities (pg. 51): Add more information about Tribal fire control. The Tribes would get that to the County.
 - Solid Waste (pg. 51): After 'transfer station', add 'and the 7 satellite container sites located throughout the County' in the last sentence of the second paragraph. Joel checked whether the containers went to the transfer station first. Janet replied that the ones north of Pablo did. Gale thought Charlo's went to the transfer station. He could check on that. Ravalli and those south of Charlo didn't go to the transfer station. Janet said it was cheaper to haul [those] directly [to Missoula]. Joel made a note to make sure it was properly stated.
 - Solid Waste (pg. 52): at the bottom of the first column, the Tribes would give a few edits for that at a later date
 - State & federal highways (pg. 52): Expand 'The county road networks' to 'The county, tribal and municipal road networks' at the bottom of the second column in the next to last sentence. Joel said he was looking at this from the County's perspective. Janet thought the focus was the roads that fed into the highway system, and Tribally and municipally maintained roads fed in. It was a

clarification. Joel mentioned the local road networks. Janet agreed you could say that. She listed five: municipal, local, Tribal, Federal or State.

- Public Transportation Facilities topics (pg. 53): the Tribes would give a paragraph about the Tribal road network and the BIA road network, which was a public network.
- Non-motorized Transportation (pg. 54): Other paths weren't mentioned here. The Tribes would get that to them also.
- Public Transit (pg. 55): The Tribes operated a transit system within Lake County, as well as from Missoula to Whitefish. They could provide some clarification on that if desired. Steve asked if this was just more stops on one route. Janet said no, they had stops around the County on the reservation portion.
- Other Public Facilities (pg. 55-56): There were lots of Tribal parks, ballfields and recreation lands. The Tribes' comment letter covered this.
- Frank: Fairgrounds (pg. 56): He assumed the fairgrounds also had sewer as well as electrical power and water.

Chapter 8 (pg. 58-72):

- Steve:
 - This was the opportunity to have discussion of the issue of property owner rights and neighbor and community rights.
 - Current Regulations (pg. 59): In the first full sentence in the second column, reword the portion that said keeping updated was 'impossible' to say that 'Lake County has been unable to keep these land use regulations updated to keep up with changing times and context.'
 - Land Use Classifications (pg. 59): Could GIS do a better map rather than apologizing in the first sentence of the last paragraph? Joel asked if he thought GIS could distinguish between tax exempt properties. Steve didn't know. They could distinguish Tribal, State and Federal lands. His question was if they could produce a better map. Joel asked if he wanted to show ownership or what the map showed, which was what the Dept. of Revenue (DOR) classified in terms of land use. Steve asked if it was important to tell what the different types of tax exempt properties were. His impression was that it was important here. Joel said the map attempted to show what the DOR classes of land use [were and] where they were classified. Steve said if the purpose of this discussion [in the Growth Policy] was fulfilled with the map they had, then that was okay. It looked to him like it wasn't. Rick thought it made it a weak read (read?) to use 'unfortunately' in the text. Janet suggested saying 'Map 11 does not distinguish' instead of 'Unfortunately, Map 11 is unable to distinguish'. Joel said he could reword that.
 - Density (pg. 61):
 - Possibly add a sentence to describe the sticky-dot exercises where that was discussed in the second column in the middle of the last paragraph, or possibly leave it out.
 - Was the density policy a strategy or a key issue? He referred to the icons used throughout the document. Was it a key issue? Joel thought it was under the umbrella of land use and development. Steve didn't know if there was an icon that would bring attention to this section and brought

this up for Joel to think about. Density, especially the DMR, had been a big issue in the County and it wouldn't hurt to draw some attention to it.

- Frank: Density (pg. 61):
 - Add 'some' before 'services can be provided' towards the end of the second paragraph.
 - Change 'building costs' to 'all residential costs' where it talked about building costs in the last line of the first column since there were other costs related to the cost of housing, such as taxes, SID's, impact fees and so forth.
 - He returned to his concept of the silent majority, and suggested changing 'interested public' to 'activists' near the end of pg. 61. Steve didn't know that he would vote for that one.
- Janet: Density Policies (pg. 62):
 - Add water quality somewhere. She wasn't sure if it was a low density area or a mid-density area. They were talking about limiting density based on agricultural and timber uses, and sensitive wildlife habitats. They had looked at vulnerable aquifer areas to try to keep the densities lower in those areas where there weren't sewer systems. Sensitive water quality needed to be added in there. Steve said it was in low density. Janet thought they had it in the 10-acre density too. She gave an example and background in the Pablo area. She confirmed for Steve that these were areas where the groundwater was high and gave examples where the soils were highly permeable. Too many septic systems in those areas would contaminate the groundwater. Steve thought they needed to be specific and not just say water quality.
 - Add something about 'vulnerable aquifer areas' to low-density. Steve summarized this would be on pg. 62, in the checked 'low density areas'. Janet said they went with the 10-acre density in some areas to protect vulnerable aquifers as well. Add it to both the low and mid-density.
 - WUI delineation (pg. 64): The Tribes' WUI delineation had been in place for quite some time. She asked for a place holder in that section so she could get more information in for that section.
- Steve: Local services, Definition (pg. 68): Mention emergency medical services along with law enforcement and fire protection and so forth.
- Janet: Agricultural water user facilities, Mitigation (pg. 68):
 - Add 'and federal' between 'state' and 'law'. A lot of irrigation was federally controlled. (She checked with Jordan in the audience, who replied.)
 - Proposals went to the Flathead Indian Irrigation Project. They couldn't often respond as quickly as the timeframe [the County] gave. An action item might be to sit down and talk with the irrigation project to find a reasonable timeframe to give them so they could respond.
 - Natural environment, Mitigation (pg. 69): Add something about the class 1 air quality status of the reservation portion of the County. Air quality needed to be mentioned somewhere and air was included in the definition of the natural environment. None of the regulations or monitoring regarding air quality were discussed. The Tribes could provide information on that. Joel explained this section was just for the review criteria for subdivisions. It defined the criteria of 76-3-608 MCA. Then it gave a policy and talked about possible mitigation

measures. He wasn't sure it would fit here. Janet wondered where they'd put air quality in this document and how they would address it. On pg. 69 in the second column, she read the last portion of the last sentence in the first paragraph and suggested saying 'that violate established air quality standards' and note that the reservation portion of the County is a class 1 air-shed. Steve asked about putting something in the Natural Resources chapter rather than discussing with the subdivision regulations. Janet thought that might be the better place for it. Steve suggested that Janet make a note and in her comments, she could suggest something about air quality in the natural resources [section].

- Wildlife habitat, Definition (pg. 70): Change 'Land and water' to 'Land, vegetation and water'. Vegetation was important for habitat also. Joel said he thought of vegetation as being part of the land and part of the water. Regarding the definitions under the subdivision criteria, Joel explained these came straight from the current subdivision regulations. He started with the base subdivision regulation definitions and didn't expand on them except where it was glaringly missing something. They wanted to avoid problems where a growth policy might conflict with regulations. The definitions made sense and it didn't seem like there had been issues with the definitions of those seven criteria.
- Wildlife habitat, a.1. Important wildlife movement corridors (pg. 70): Add a sentence that these are often riparian corridors. Riparian areas were important movement corridors although there were others. Joel checked that there should be an explanation of the importance of riparian vegetation, and Janet said just riparian areas. 'Riparian corridors along streams are an example of important wildlife movement corridors.' It was important that people understood how important riparian corridors were. Joel didn't see where it was talking about the attributes of the corridors themselves. Steve said it just said they're there. Lee noted that 2.b on pg. 70 talked about significant wildlife habitat and included riparian areas. Janet thought it should be mentioned under the corridors. She offered to explain it in more depth at another time.
- Policy (pg. 71): Replace 'important' with 'crucial' or 'significant' and add 'big game' between 'bears' and 'waterfowl'. Steve thought she wanted to be more specific.

Steve suggested Janet could add that to her upcoming comments. Were there other things she wouldn't be able to add to her comments in the next couple weeks? Janet said no. What [the Tribes] had for chapter 9 was in their letter.

Additional comments:

- Frank:
 - Chapter 6, Agricultural Resources (pg. 35-36):
 - Scratch the comment of the next-to-last sentence at the bottom of the first column. He thought it was an editorial comment to which he was sensitive, and felt the comment had an agenda. There was an attack on small orchards on Finley Point.
 - On pg. 36, above the 'Community Goal' icon, replace 'hobby farms' with 'orchards'. He said every farmer or rancher had to supplement income.

- Chapter 6, Timber Resources (pg. 36-37): He thought they'd have to evacuate Finley Point last summer. It had one exit. The reduction of fuels was a big deal.
- Affordable housing: He mentioned the idea of having the growth policy to provide opportunities for lower cost housing or for more housing options in areas that were already zoned like Finley Point where additional houses were not allowed, only guest houses maybe. There was a thought about other housing to provide lower cost housing in areas. One reason people did orchards on Finley Point was they were looking for supplemental income. Rentals and other housing options weren't allowable. The idea of value-added products was a great idea. It would change zoning, allowing some retailing to be done. To him, Finley Point had to go with agriculture and promote it, which preserved open space, or allow other kinds of businesses or enterprises to operate, or let the rich take it over.
- Steve: He wondered if there was a place they could add some discussion of the zoning and improving the availability of affordable housing by adjusting the zoning to allow multiple dwellings per lot or something else in certain areas. [The Board] could make some comment like that. He didn't know that they wanted to be specific about Finley Point and orchards as an alternative. They might consider that with Frank's comment, if that was appropriate for one of the housing sections.

Steve checked with the Board about continuing with Chapter 9 or other alternatives. Jacob pointed out they had Janet's comments on Chapter 9 already in writing. The Board opted to continue.

Steve observed they commented about issue statements in the previous chapters. If changes were done in issue statements and vision statements, he guessed that these would be updated [in chapter 9] at the same time.

Chapter 9:

- Steve: 1.1.2 (pg. 76): Add the Office of Emergency Management (OEM) to the 'Who Carries Out' column and add that 'Citizens understand many of their first responders are their neighbors who have volunteered without pay to take this responsibility' to the 'Signs of Success' column. He thought a lot of people, especially newcomers to the County, didn't realize emergency services and first responders were often volunteers.
- Lee: Acronyms & abbreviated terms list (pg. 75): Add CIP. Steve asked about two CIP's, Capital Improvement Plan and Community Infrastructure Plan, and if they were interchangeable or needed to be distinguished in this document. Joel thought the Growth Policy draft appropriately referenced it but the [CIP] document itself called itself two different things. He confirmed it was the same document being referenced by both.
- Steve:
 - 1.2.1, action 25 (pg. 78):
 - Add an action that says 'Work with CS&KT to implement and enforce regulations like lakeshore protection regulations and zoning districts, setback and buffers on Tribally owned land.' Some Tribally owned lands around the lake weren't observing the same policies to protect the water quality in Flathead Lake as the non-Tribally owned lands. They should see if they could close that gap.

- 5.1.2, Objective (pg. 90): Add ‘Minimize changes to the existing culture and land uses in the neighborhood by respecting the expectations of all the land owners’. He didn’t know if there was better wording available to make the point that some people invest in land based on what they see of the neighborhood and what the recurrent regulations suggested for that neighborhood as far as density and land uses and so forth. In the middle of that, [if the County] relaxes some regulations and somebody decides to put in some other land use there, that causes a problem for the people who invested in the land with other expectations.
- Frank: 5.2.1, Objectives (pg. 90): After ‘Montana Constitutions’ add ‘that support agriculture and’. That was under fire right now. He referred to article 12, section 1, paragraph 1.
- Steve:
 - 5.3.2, Objective (pg. 92): His notes were to ‘Work with CS&KT on buffers and the lakeshore protection regulations.’ This might be inferred in the way it was currently written.
 - 5.4.2, Objective (pg. 92): Like the previous comment, they needed to work with CS&KT on buffers and the lakeshore protection regulations for this one also.
 - Consider including the CIP somewhere in [chapter 9] as an action if it fit. They hadn’t already identified a goal on roads. Was this in the document somewhere? Did an action here to update of the CIP belong in this document? If it was a general document and that was something that the County did, it seemed like it could be in here. Joel said he’d look at that.

Steve asked if Board members had additional comments. None came forth. He asked Joel if they’d missed anything that he wanted comment on. Joel thought they’d done a pretty thorough job. They could email him with additional comments, clarifications or whatever. Steve reiterated that other citizens could email Joel or the Planning Dept. with comments for the next few weeks. He asked if a date had been set, then summarized that Joel would send out an email to let people know what the deadline was going to be for comments on this draft. Wally said they’d get a date by Monday.

MINUTES (10:08 pm)

Steve noted that there were actually two sets of minutes on the same page. He guessed that this worked. The first was from Sept. 13, where they didn’t have a quorum and postponed the meeting for a week. The Sept. 20 meeting minutes began right after that.

Motion made by Rick Cothorn, and seconded by Janet Camel, to approve the Sept. 13 & 20, 2017 meeting minutes as written. Motion carried, all in favor.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

Steve Rosso, chair, adjourned the meeting at 10:10 pm.